ENGLANDS SETTLEMENT MISTAKEN:

OR A

Short Survey of a Pamphlet

CALLED

ENGLAND'S SETTLEMENT

Upon the two solid Foundations of the Peoples Civil *and* Religious LIBERTIES.

PLEADING

For a Toleration of all Religions.

Wherein

His Ten ARGUMENTS for Toleration are Confuted, as so many Sophisms and Fallacies.

By a Well-willer to both Civil and Religious Liberties of the People.

London, Printed by *D. Maxwell*, 1660.

MAY 26, 1913

ENGLANDS SETTLEMENT MISTAKEN, &c.

THe Author of *Englands Settlement*, is by many wiſe men thought to be a diſguiſed *Jeſuite*, or a *Jeſuited Sectary*: 'The voice is *Jacobs* voice, but the 'hands are the hands of *Eſau*.' He perſonates in his words, a *Proteſtant*, putting himſelf amongſt us, as one of us, but his Deſign is, under a pretence of an *Univerſal Toleration, of all Religions*; as to aſperſe our both Church and State, with the ugly crime of Perſecution; ſo eſpecially to plead for Liberty of Conſcience to Papiſts and Recuſants, as ſhall be made appear in ventilation of the Tract it ſelf. He hath ſcraped together, out of ſeveral Sectarian Books or Pamphlets, *Anabaptiſts*, *Levellers*, *Fifth Monarchy* men, &c. no leſs then ten *Arguments*, which as they are very plauſible (like a fair picture upon courſe cloath afar off) to ſimple and weak apprehenſions; ſo being looked on nearer hand, and touched by the hand of a ſolid underſtanding, are like the Apples of *Sodom*, which touched turn to aſhes, and prove but ſo many thred-bare *Sophiſms*, or tranſparent Fallacies, often confuted. His method of proceeding (that they that have not his Tract may ſee what he hath ſaid, and judg the better of it) is this:

1. He seemes, out of pity and compassion to the Nation, (whiles he is secretly piling up his barrels of Gunpowder, (once more) under the Parliament House, to blow it up, by procuring an *Act of Toleration* for all Religions) to exemplifie, and bewaile our past and present miseries, as the *Amazement* of the world, and the *intolerable burden* of 'the nation; for so he sayes; [They experience, that their "so much talk'd of, and so often promised liberty, has proved nothing but real and almost intolerable Slavery: "their plenty has been turned into miserable poverty; "and their peace, into endless troubles] How truly let others judg.

2. 'He tells us (what indeed we find) [There has been "a curse upon the Government these ten years; it hath "been all that time a rolling, like *Sysiphus* stone, and inconstant like the Moon: The judgments of God have "been very terrible and universal, both over Church and "State, and have gone round over all sorts of Persons, "as well of high as low degree. For the late English Church "hath been quite overturned, the King himself, the Head "thereof, tragically beheaded, and his posterity rigorously "excluded. The Nobility is in a manner degraded, the "house of Peeres abolished, the Ancient Gentry slighted, "the Marchants and Commons, by decay of trade, and by "the unhappy conjunction of extraordinary Taxes, impo"verished, Yea the Parliaments themselves, have not gone "without some chastisement. For their own hired servants, "have oftener, than once, lifted their heels against them, "and without any lawful Authority, but according to their "own pleasures or interests, have dissolved, called, anni"hilated and revived them. Only the Souldiers, whom "God hath used as Instruments to punish others, may seem "to have gone hitherto unpunished] How true this is also let others judg.

3 He seems to take upon him to be a prophet, and to foretel what is like to come upon those (the Army) that "have not yet smarted: for so he says: [Every thing must "have its time, to come to maturity: and God Almighty has

" has begun already to manifeſt his judgments, upon ſome of " their principal Heads and firſt Movers; *O. P.* his poſterity, " and others of his chief Officers &c. which may ſerve for " a warning for all the reſt, to prevent Gods Judgments, " leſt they fall heavily upon them, here, or hereafter] They may do well to conſider it, and lay it to heart

4. Having done this, he inquires into the cauſes of theſe judgments and divine viſitations, and our ſo long unſettle-' ment: and reſolves well in general, [Some very heinous " ſin or ſins have provoked them; but what theſe ſins are in " particular, is not ſo eaſie to determine, to every mans " ſatisfaction,] Yet he goes on, in the ſearch of them, and " firſt gives us his own judgment upon the caſe; [it may " probably be affirmed, if not averred as a certain truth, " that Soul-tyranny, or coercive power over mens conſcien-" ces, is the principal ſin that hath drawn down theſe judg-" ments from heaven, (for ſome reaſons,) For firſt it is an " heinous ſin in it ſelf, (as he will ſhew ſhortly) and eſpeci-" ally if it be exerciſed againſt the true Religion:] Before we hear the reſt, conſider this; Firſt, he ſhould have ſaid, Soul Tyranny is an heinous ſin, (not eſpecially, but) only when it is exerciſed againſt the true Religion: Coercive power exerciſed againſt falſe Religion, is no Tyranny, no ſin at all, but an Act of Juſtice, or Religion. Secondly he forgot himſelf in this Aſſertion; and did not remember, that in Rome it ſelf, Italy and Spaine, &c. where that Soul Tyranny is moſt rigorouſly exerciſed, (ſetting up a falſe Religion, and perſecuting the true, in their High commiſſion, and Inquiſition Courts:) there is as yet, the greateſt peace and proſperity, and flouriſhing of thoſe Nations, their ſins being not yet mature, for their long ago determined judgments. However, it ſeems, thoſe Politician, are not of this mans Cabinet Council, that Toleration of all Religions, is one of the Pillars of a States Settlement: Its experimented too much, and too long, through many ages, that no hatreds (and ſo, no differences,) are like thoſe of different Religions: and (which is obſervable) the nearer they come unto an union in matters of Religion, (if yet there be ſome diffe-

rence)

rence) the more ſtrong and deadly are their hatreds, the more fierce and violent their Animoſities. The Jew and the Samaritan were; The Proteſtants and Papiſts, The Lutheran Arminians and Calviniſts &c. are at this day, the moſt deadly enemies. The reaſon is well given, by one not 'meanly learned, [They both plead for their God; and "that man hath no Religion, that can put up an Indignity 'offered to his God.] See that ſtory Act. 19. 23. &c. But Thirdly, he forgot himſelf once more; and did not conſider, that all thoſe miſeries (or moſt of them) have fallen upon this Nation, ſince the deſired Liberty of conſcience was gratified with a Toleration, or Connivence at leaſt. And whither they will ever end, till Religion be eſtabliſhed in truth, purity and power, is a probleme not yet determined, but may be, ere we have done.

A ſecond Reaſon why Soul tyranny is ſo heinous a ſin, and cauſe of our miſeries, he gives to be this; that [This "Nation hath been deeply guilty of it above theſe hundred "years] He means forſooth in proſecuting Papiſts, not for their Religion, but their Rebellion, and rebellious principles. What is this, but to call our Church and State Perſecutors? But of this more anon.

It is true, (which is his third Reaſon of our miſeries) "[Each party objects perſecution to another, as the cauſe "of all their miſeries] But one party only truly: For, as there is but one true Religion, ſo there can be no perſecution properly but of that, the reſt is a juſt proſecution of errors and hereſies, that deſtroy not only the Faith, but the Souls of many. And his diſtinct on I deſire may be remem-'bred, as of uſe hereafter. But that this was the cauſe, [or 'principle ground of the late wars between King and Parliament] is is utterly falſe: The ground of their differences (as they held them forth) was the encroachment upon their civil Liberties, and priviledges of Parliament: but I leave this to them whom it concerns; as for what is made the judgments of others, concerning our miſeries, by Papiſts, Presbyterians, Royaliſts, Independents it is not worth the while to debate; Its like every party will remove the ob-

Arbitrary Government was one of the alledged grounds of the late war, &c. p. 5.

jection

jection from it ſelf, and charge it upon others, let them agree it.

3. 'He is now drawing towards his main buſineſs; [what "ever the ſin be, that hath drawn the foreſaid Judgments "upon theſe Nations; it is certain, with allmoſt all Pru- "dent and Unbyaſſed men, that this State eſpecially as "matters now ſtand, in ſuch a variety of Religions ſhall "never be firmly ſetled, under any form of Government, "unleſs it be built upon ſuch a ſolid Foundation, as may aſ- "ſert and ſecure the peoples liberties, both Religious and 'Civil.' leave but out theſe words [eſpecially as matters now ſtand in ſuch a variety of Religion] which have a ſecret deſign, as we ſhall hear preſently; the thing will be granted 'by all prudent men, [that no State can be firmly ſetled, un- "leſs it be built upon ſuch a ſolid foundation, as may aſſert 'and ſecure the peoples liberties, both civil and Religious.] But, I pray, what is that foundation? In his Title page he ſpeaks of two ſolid foundations for the ſettlement of *England*; and makes them there and here, to be the peoples civil and Religious Liberties: when as theſe themſelves, do need a foundation to ſecure and ſettle them upon, which he cunningly conceals and is unwilling to diſcover; for 'thus he aſſerts again, [The two pillars whereupon this State "muſt be ſetled, are the Spiritual and civil liberties of the page 4. "people, that is, in the Parliaments language, as Men, as "Chriſtians.] But upon what foundation, ſhall theſe two pil- lars ſtand? The peoples Liberties civil or Religious, are but the walls, or roof of this building; and as he ſaid before, muſt be built upon ſome other ſolid foundation, which what 'it is, I deſire to know. He ſeems to reſolve it, into [*juſt* "*Lawes*, to free the people from Slavery in their Perſons, "and Oppreſſion in their Goods.] And indeed, that may go for one of the founda ions to ſettle a State upon, (*viz*) *Righteouſnes*, to aſſert and ſecure their Civil and Religious Liberties; but there is another, and a ſtronger foundation, and that is, the *True Religion* eſtabliſhed and practiſed; of which more hereafter.

For the firſt pillar or foundation, that of civil liberties; f.

the

the people, he ſays, he ſhall ſpeak but a little; and I leſs; it is not our main buſineſs in hand: Three things only he "delivers concerning the civil Liberties. [1 That they were "much more violated ſince the Kings death, then before in "his time; *viz.* 1. In their Repreſentatives, when the "Major part of the Parliament members were violently "thruſt out of the Houſe, and divers of them Impriſoned; "and much more when they were diſſolved without any "Lawful Authority, by force and power of the ſword, "which the peoples ſervants turned againſt themſelves. "2. By the change of Government and Election of a new "ſupreme Magiſtrate, without the ſuffrages of the peo-"ple, &c. 3. When freeborn perſons were impriſoned "by Arbitrary power, and inhumanly uſed in Priſon; "Trepanning men into Plots, and then cruelly executed &c. "Laſtly in their Goods, by exorbitant and continual Ta-"xes, &c.]

Then 2. like a good Phyſitian or Stateſman, he preſcribes the Remedies to theſe our Maladies: I ſhall but "name them: 1. [That ſome courſe be taken to make the "power of the ſword ſubordinate to the civil power; that "the Souldiers be not ſuffered any more to domineere over "their Maſters: as the Romane Prætorian bands did, and "the Turks Janiſaries do. 2. That no perſon be impri-"ſoned, nor his goods touched, without breach of a known "Law 3. That at length the people may be freed from their "long and exorbitant Taxes; by reducing the Army to "as ſmall and competent a number as can be, &c. 4. All "poſſible means uſed to quicken Trade, &c.] 3. He ſeems to propheſie once more to the little comfort of the people. "[When all is done, (let them make the beſt Settlement "they can) the people are not like to be in ſo good a caſe, "as they were in the Kings time, &c. The Government ſet-"led, cannot be maintained without a continued Army, "and Navy, nor thoſe, without continual Taxes, Ex-"ciſe, and other inſupportable burthens, &c.] which with him, I leave to the conſideration of the Preſent pow-ers.

He

'He now comes to the [other maine Basis or Pillar, "that must uphold the great Fabrick of this State, to "make it stand firme and sure, the Spiritual or Religious "Liberties of the people; which consists in this, that no "person professing Faith in Christ, be molested or oppressed "in his conscience, for his judgment in matters of Re-'ligion, or in things relating to the worship of God.]

1. That true Religion maintained in its power and purity, is a maine Basis or Power of a State, I have often heard; but the peoples Religious Liberties, are but the product and fruit of that Religion, or of civil Righteousnes, in a well setled State. 2. If by Religious Liberty, he meane, (as he does) Toleration of all Religions, in all that pretend to conscience; that every man, may not only think and be on what Religion he please, but practise accordingly, it is to be feared, it will in stead of a solid foundation, prove a quicksand or quagmire, and quickly sink, or draw after it the peoples civil Liberties, which is his other pillar: For is there not a conscience to be made in civil Liberties? And must not a man follow his conscience in civil things as well as in Religious? Suppose a man be an Anabaptist, that out of conscience denies all Magistracy; or a Leveller, or Familist, that hold all things ought to be common, goods and wives and all; may he be suffered to follow his Conscience in these things? Or may he be restrained or punished, if he take another mans goods, or abuse his wife? &c. If so, is not this to exercise a coercive power over Conscience? If not, will it not destroy, as some Principles of Religion, so all Humane Society? Let him but make the peoples civil Liberties commensurable, with his Religious Liberties, that is, that as any man may be of any Religion, so every man may, in civil affairs, do what seems good in his own eyes, without restraint upon his Conscience, and see what a Common-wealth he hath Setled, upon the foundations of Civil and Religious Liberties. He may find the patterne of it, in the 5. or 6. last Chapters of the Book of Judges.

3. 'But wherein doth this Spiritual Liberty consist? [In "this, that no person professing faith in Christ, be mole-

ſted or oppreſſed in his conſcience, for his judgment in 'matters of Religion &c.] If this be the meaning, that no man ſhall be moleſted in his conſcience, for his judgment only, in matters of Religion, and Worſhip, it will eaſily be granted; for what Magiſtrate, or Church, can take cognizance of mens judgments, while they keep them to themſelves? But the queſtion is, whether every man that profeſſes faith in Chriſt, muſt be left to himſelf, to publiſh and propagate his erroneous and heretical judgment to others; and to practiſe openly, what worſhip he, in his erring judgment, thinks to be true? Beſides conſcience pretended, (and ſo Religion) is true or falſe; if it be truly informed in the true Religion, he ought not to be moleſted or oppreſſed in conſcience in matters of Religion: But if falſe; to deny ſome kind of moleſtation (though we allow not opreſſion) to ſuch a conſcience, is to deny charity to a ſoul running headlong to Hell for feare of troubling a miſleading Conſcience: Contrary to that Scripture Rule; [Of ſome have compaſſion, making a difference, and others ſave with feare, pulling them out of the fire:] Jude v. 22. 23.

Laſtly, He makes the Religious Liberty of the people, to conſiſt in this, [That no perſon profeſſing faith in Chriſt, be moleſted in his conſcience &c.] But this Rule is too narrow, and too ſtrait-laced; allowing a coercive power, to moleſt ſome conſciences, *viz.* of ſuch as profeſs not faith in Chriſt; And ſuch an abortive brat, is that late Act of Parliament (falſly ſo called) made in more haſt, than good Speed, (the night before their laſt diſſolution by the Army) for Toleration of tender conſciences, almoſt in the ſame words. For if no perſon may be moleſted for conſcience, then not a Jew, that denies and blaſphemes Jeſus Chriſt: not a Turke for Mahometan worſhip; not an Heathen, that worſhips the Sun, or ſome old worm-eaten Idol; not any man of any Religion whatever. All or any of theſe may ſet up their Temples, and worſhip of their Gods in England, without any moleſtation of conſcience: For they have conſciences as well as other men; and act according to their conſcences; as well as they, and conſcience (ſays he, ſay all men) may

not

not be forced: Behold an Universal Toleration indeed: Would he see a parallel to it? He may find it (I say not, in *New Rome*, where Jews and others find far more favour than protestants; but) either in old *Rome*, where they had a Pantheon of all Gods; or in *Solomons* old age and doting times, allowing, (under the view of Gods own Temple) high places to all his wives Idols, and a Toleration to worship them: 1. King 11. 7, 8. [Then did *Solomon* "build an high place for *Chemosh* the abomination of *Mo-*"*ab*, in the hill that is before *Jerusalem*; and for *Moloch*, "the abomination of the children of *Ammon*; and like-"wise did he for all his strange wives, which burnt incense "and sacrificed to their Gods.] *England* (it seems) is grown old, and is come to *Solomons* dotage; an hundred year (or thereabouts, the age of *Solomon*) it is, since the first Reformation from Popery, by protestant Religion, (so long this Author accounts this our Religion, to have persecuted the Papists, as above:) and that which she could never be perswaded to do, in her younger days, (*viz.* to grant a Toleration to Papists or other Sectaries) she now in her dotage, in favour to her outlandish Paramours, the Jesuites, hath by a pretended Parliament, too liberally granted: That which the former Kings and Parliaments, both when Popish, and since they had the name of Protestants, would never yield; that which the King of Scots, would rather loose the Assistance offered by two potent Popish Princes, to settle him in his Throne, than yeild unto: That which Papists and Jesuites deny to yield to Protestants, in their dominions; that this lower and latter end of a broken Parliament, hath yielded to Papists, and the worst of Sectaries; To the shame of Parliaments, our Nation, and Religion; But I forbear.

But to the Setlement, he says; [The Government of these Nations as the case now stands, cannot be firmly setled, without taking away all Restraint over Mens consciences and granting an innocent Toleration.] This is the question now between us. In the stating whereof, are these things very considerable. 1. He qualifies it, with these

words, [as the case now stands] which a little after, he explains by these words [especially when variety of Religions have got footing in a Nation.] 1. It seems then, where the case is otherwise, that variety of Religions have got no footing, it may be lawful to lay some Restraint upon erring consciences, and to deny the most innocent Toleration: But did he not say universally, no man professing Christ, is to be molested in conscience, for his judgment in matters of Religion? Which if it were true, no cases nor exceptions need to be put in; no Restraint must be laid upon mens consciences, to start or publish some new Religion, according to their consciences; for that will prove a way to unsettle that Nation or Church. 2. Must all restraint of conscience be taken away? What, of those consciences, whose principles are destructive, not only to Religion in the Church, but also to the peace and safety of the State; as those of Papists, that it is Lawful to murder Kings, made heretical by the *Pope*; or to follow Impulses of Spirit, to kill Anti-Christian Priests, as the Quakers (the Jesuites disciples) now begin to assert and avow? That State that will allow such consciences with such principles, deserve to be destroyed, as having neither *Policy*, *Prudence*, nor *Piety*: Yet all Restraint, in this case must be taken away, says our Author, and an innocent tolleration (which is a kind of contradiction) granted: 3. But see the Impudence of Jesuites: They have been the Instruments to give variety of Religions footing in the Nation; and now, they tell us, as the case now stands, the Government cannot be setled, till all restraint of conscience be taken away, and an Innocent toleration granted: But hear his reasons.

1. "[All men know, the freedome of conscience in "matters of Religion, is the last, and highest interest of "man, valued by him above all earthly things, and there- "fore nothing can be more earnestly desired by him: And "nothing is more repugnant to man, than a Restraint or "Coercive Power over his conscience; and therefore can- "not but raise a deep discontent in him, and earnest de sire

to

"to be free of that ſoul-tyranny; and to wiſh, and wor-
"(if it be in their power) and make a change of that Go-
"vernment: whence it clearly followes, that that ſtate
"which puts a reſtraint upon mens conſciences, eſpecially
"when variety of Religions hath got a footing in it, can-
"not be well and ſolidly ſetled, but is expoſed to unavoi-
"dable troubles, jealouſies, and danger of ruine.] Thus far the Jeſuite; To which we ſay, Liberty of Conſcience, in profeſsion of the true Religion, is a thing of ſpecial value, and by all deſired; but liberty granted to erroneous and heretical conſciences, is a thing moſt dangerous and deſtructive, to their own and other ſouls, and by no wiſe man to be deſired, nor by any religious State to be granted. But obſerve again, thoſe interpoſed words (eſpecially when variety of Religions hath got a footing in a Nation.) And again, (eſpecially as the caſe now ſtands) obſerve, (what was noted above) that it was the deſign of the Jeſuites, on purpoſe, to break our Religion into factions, that ſo they might plead for toleration of all; upon this ground, that the State cannot now be ſolidly ſetled, if they put a reſtraint upon mens conſciences: At *Rome*, and elſe where, where they are all of one falſe Religion; they may, and do put reſtraint upon mens conſciences, that whatever they think in their judgments, they may not dare to publiſh their opinions, and ſet up new Religions: May not a Proteſtant Magiſtrate, lay a reſtraint upon all Religions, but the true, by way of remedy, which they do by way of prevention, knowing, that if variety of Religions be ſuffered to get footing in a Nation, they will unſettle the peace of the Nation, as well, as where they have already got footing: But enough of that; In particular to the Argument, I ſay many things. 1. It is no Paradox to ſay, conſcience it ſelf (though the body may) cannot be forced or reſtrained, (as the will cannot) but is ever ſeen, when the tongue or body may be bound: [The Word of God is not bound,] though I be, ſaid the great Apoſtle in Priſon. The conſcience hath its freedome, either to practiſe according to it, or to ſuffer in its reſtraint, not

with

with discontent (as he) but upon choice, and joyfully too. 2. That's no good conscience, that desires, and works to be free from soul-tyranny, by working a change of that Government, by which it is racked. The Apostles and primitive Christians, (when they had power in their hand, as the greater number) did not so, but pleaded and urged, obedience either active or passive, to the worst of Governments. Whence it appears, that this is no part of the Doctrine of Jesus, but a drop of Jesuitisme: That restraint of conscience may (lawfully) put men upon designs to ruine the State, under which they live and suffer. This may be part of the Politicians Catechisme, which he speaks of, hatched in the *Conclave* of *Rome*, or the Jesuites juncto's; but is wisedome *earthly, sensual, divelish*, yea, too often practised by them, as in other States, so in ours of *England*; "His own instances shall convince him, [that of the forraign "Invasion, in the year 88, and again by a detestible Gunpow-"der Plot, of some few desperate Papists, *&c.*] Detestible Plots indeed, and desperate, not by some few Papists (or as one called them, unfortunate Gentlemen, not for the undertaking, but unfortunate in their success) not by some few Papists, but by an Armado the one, the other not without the Approbation of many Priests and Jesuites, and the Canonization of the chief Contriver, *Garnet*, at *Rome*. True Protestants have ever hated such Religion, as allowes People to rebell against, and endeavour the *ruine* or *subversion* of the State, rather then suffer for Religion: As for those instances, in *France*, *Holland*, *Scotland*, or any other; I shall not take upon me to justifie or condemn them, because I know not their grounds; they are old enough, and able to plead for themselves: But this only I shall commend to the consideration of the present Powers; ["That "though some other Sects or several Religions (as he calls "them) have made Insurrections, since the change of "the Government (above ten years since) to the danger "of the State; yet, those that are true Presbyterians, have "never in the least, devised any Plots, or moved a Finger a-"gainst any of the Powers that have been uppermost, but

"have

" have ſat ſtill in ſilence and ſubmiſſion; reſolved to yield " active obedience to their commands, where lawfully they " may, or paſſive obedience, to ſuffer, where their conſci- " ences dare not act, or approve.] And to this man, I ſay, The Presbyterians have never exerciſed any Soul tyranny over mens conſciences, upon any of different opinions from them, in matters of Religion, (as never having had any ſuch power granted them) unleſs upon their own conſenting Members, in a ſpiritual way, which himſelf allowes. Whom have they ever puniſhed in their bodies, mulcted in their goods, cropt off their ears, impriſoned, baniſhed, *&c.* They abhor the thoughts, (much more the practiſe) of ſuch ſoul-tyranny, and leave it either to the former Government, or to his holy Father the Pope, from whence it had its Original. Yet theſe are the men, whom this bold " *Calumniator* dare aſperſe [as overturners of the State, " (ſome more preciſe ſort of Proteſtants, who paſt all be- " fore, under the name of Puritans) and that upon the " ſame ſcore of Religion, to be free of all reſtraint of their " conſciences, and enjoy a greater freedome.] The Lord rebuke thee, thou ſlanderous Tongue; that reſtraint was laid upon the conſciences of thoſe honeſt men, who were unjuſtly called Puritans, is too evident to be denyed: That they might ſeek to be free from that reſtraint, may alſo be yielded, but not in any ſeditious, or tumultuous way; but in a way of Addreſs to the Supream Power of Parliament, abhorring the very thought of overturning the State; though by the fraud and ſubtilty of ſome, that have followed, which they never intended: Himſelf hath told us, what was one, (and a chief, if not the only) cauſe " of the late Wars, [Arbitrary Government, and en- " croaching upon the Peoples Civil Liberties. *p.* 5.] not at all, or not primarily, [*upon the ſcore of Religion*] though they might juſtly fear, that by Arbitrary Government, Religion at laſt might come to ſuffer; as all that know the ſtate of thoſe times, cannot but confeſs. 3. As for his *in-* " *nocent toleration*, let us hear what he ſayes; [An inof- " fenſive Toleration in matters of Religion ſecures all; and

" cements

"cements the Peoples greateſt Intereſt, to preſerve and de-
"fend the Common-wealth; whereof we ſee a near and
"clear example in the Common-wealth of *Holland*.]
But 1. Why may he not conclude the like for Peoples civil Liberties? An innocent, and inoffenſive *community* of all things, will ſecure all, and cement the Peoples Intereſt, to preſerve and defend the Common-wealth, wherein they enjoy ſuch freedome: It is *propriety* that puts wicked men upon Breach of Peace; that puts men upon ſtealing one from another: Let rich men but be perſwaded, to let their houſes, goods, and money be free, and common to all, there will be no diſturbance in the State; ſo in matters of Religion; let men have liberty to be of any Religion, or none, true, or falſe; let them blaſpheme the Name of God, and Jeſus Chriſt, worſhip them with what worſhip they pleaſe, though forbidden; and the Church and States need not trouble themſelves, or fear any troubles. It is the Magiſtrate, or the Church, that by denying People this liberty, and laying reſtraint upon their conſciences, that are guilty of all unſetling diſturbances, *&c.* 2. The Toleration of the Hollander: I never yet heard a truly religious man to commend or approve, till now, if now it is, I fear, more out of policy, than piety: But I believe, if the Hollander had not a better Guard by Sea and Land to ſecure and defend his State, than the cement, or untempered Mortar of Toleration; he had long ere this been reduced, either to his old Maſter, or to utter deſtruction: However, *malè parta, male dilabentur*, when the time comes: We ſee the fruit of Toleration in *England*, ſince it hath been granted; the variety of Religions, as it hath ſerved in one ſenſe, to ſtrengthen a prevailing party, by the politick Maxim, *Divide & Impera*: So it hath made no ſmall diſturbances in the Church and State; and had they not an Army to quiet them, had long ere this, laid them in the duſt, and the Nation in aſhes: And what will be the iſſue, God only knows.

2. His next Reaſon, or Argument, is borrowed from one Mr. *Collier*, an Anabaptiſt at leaſt, if not Jeſuited, and conſiſts

consists of many, no less than four Arguments, which all "have respect to the Magistrate, [As by Coercive power in "matters of Religion, becoming guilty of high Treason, "against Jesus Christ, in usurping upon his prerogative:] But the man hath quite mistaken the question, (as no doubt this Author knows, but would take no notice of it.) This he undertakes to prove, [That it is unlawful for the Magi- "strate to pretend any right of Coercive power, over mens "consciences, and an heinous sin in him to exercise it.] The thing is true in it self, but not to the question. The Magistrate hath no more Coercive power over mens consciences, than the Church hath over mens bodies: Christ only is Lord over the conscience. Magistrates cannot impose any Laws of their own over the consciences of men, nor force any to believe or practise, contrary to the Laws of Christ, or contrary to their consciences; or punish them for not so believing, &c. But the question is, whether a Magistrate Christian, at least, professing the true Religion, may not use his power to command professed Christians, to the observance of the Laws of Christ, and the outward prescribed worship of God, and punish them for not conforming thereunto? whether also, he may not restrain men from publishing and practising of Errors and Heresies, and false worship, contrary to the true Religion, to the perverting and destroying of mens souls? And if his Arguments prove not the Negative of these, they prove nothing. But let us hear them.

1. ["The Magistrate hath received no such power, from "Christ in the New Testament, in matters relating to Faith "and Worship: *Ergo*, Christ hath reserved the power over "conscience to himself, as Lord of it.] The whole of this may be granted, and is granted above, in a right sence, without any prejudice to the question between us: Christ only is Lord over the Conscience, to prescribe Laws of Faith, and Worship: 2. The second is the same with the first in sense. The Magistrate cannot impose Rules of Faith and Worship upon people, &c. But may he not impose the Laws of God and Christ upon his people? And ought he not therein to be obeyed? And Punish those that re-

fuſe them, or walk contrary to them? And if he command contrary to thoſe Rules of Chriſt, though he muſt not be therein obeyed, muſt he not Paſſively be ſubmitted to? And what if Chriſt have not in the New Teſtament committed ſuch power to the Magiſtrate, (as will be proved he hath) is it not ſufficient that he hath committed it to him in the old Teſtament. And that not only the Kings of *Judah*, but Heathen Kings have executed ſuch a Power? See *Dan.* 3. 29. and 6. 26. So that it is a Moral duty of a Magiſtrate, known by the light of Nature, as Gods Vicegerent, to publiſh the Laws of God, to command obedience to them, and to puniſh Trangreſſors: and is not this a *Coercive* power committed to the Magiſtrate? 3. He "thus argues, [If the Magiſtrates have ſuch a power, "then all or ſome: If all, then Heathen Magiſtrates have "it, but that's abſurde: If Chriſtian only, they may be of "divers Religions, and command contrary to Chriſts Rules, "one, one Religion, another, another, &c.] This is the ſum of his Dilemmatical diſcourſe. But the Anſwer is eaſie; this power (we ſpeak of) belongs to all Magiſtrates, as Magiſtrates, (even Heathens as afore) though all are not in a capacity, or have ability to perform it. As in the fifth *Commandment*, all parents are bound to inſtruct, and command their children to know and fear God, and correct their diſobedience, but Heathen parents cannot rightly do it: The power of the Magiſtrate (who is *pater patriæ*) is the very ſame, in a greater latitude, and belongs to the ſame *Commandment*: though all cannot perform it, but "that's their fault. *Obj.* [They may be of different Re-"ligions or beliefs, and think themſelves in the right, and "ſo every one that hath power, will perſecute another; "Proteſtants, Papiſts, and *contra*.] At their perill be it; if they believe falſly, and perſecute the true Religion: But ought they to do ſo? May they that are of a falſe Religion perſecute thoſe that profeſs the true Religion? Did he not ſay, above, this was the *moſt heinous ſin*? And may not they that profeſs and have the true *Religion*, proſecute thoſe that are heretical, to bring them to a true belief and pra-

ctiſe

wise: This case is parallel: A Magistrate may punish offenders against righteousness in civil affairs, *Ergo*, He or another may persecute others for righteousness; but "(saies he) [Allow this, that divers Religions may per- "secute one another, and what confusion will this bring "into a State, into the World?] *Sol.* 1. Is there no difference between prosecution of evil doers? and persecution of the innocent, every Thief, and every Heretick, if punished or restrained, cry out of persecution. But how unjustly? 2. Hath not Christ foretold it, and by his Providence so orders it, that there shall be persecution of the good for his sake, and for righteousness sake? yea, and command his people to suffer it (not with opposition, or a desire to ruine and subvert that State that offers it) but without impatience, with greatest joy and gladness. How unlike to Jesus, are our Jesuites? 4. His fourth Argument "is this; [Christ hath committed his authority in mat- "ters of Religion, relating to worship, to his Church; "and commands to tell the Church, &c. *Ergo*, Not to the "Magistrate.] But 1. Why did he leave out in matters of Faith, that might have given us cause to suspect the Jesuite, who allowes to his Pope, power in matters of Faith, in his *Trent* Creed; but in worship, the Church (he would have us believe) have some latitude of power, which she hath not, except in meer circumstances, not to appoint the worship it self. 2. For I ask, Hath Christ committed his Authority to the Church, to coin new Articles of Faith, and new forms of Worship? If not, the Church and Magistrate are herein equal in their power; between whom this Argument would insinuate a difference. The Church hath no Authority Coercive upon mens consciences, in matters relating to Faith and Worship, more then the Magestrate hath; but both are, in their own way, to publish and look to the execution of Christs rules in both: The only difference is, that the power of the Church is Spiritual, that of the Magistrate Corporal. And they may not meddle with each other Powers; the Magistrate may no more exercise the spiritual power of the Church, than the

Church may exercise power over mens bodies or estates. 3. This Disputer, (if he understand what he says) would insinuate, that Christ hath committed Authority over mens consciences to the Church, which the Apostle earnestly disclaims, 2 Cor. 1. 24. And yet the Church hath some kind of Coercive power over her Members, as appears in her censure of excommunication, which our Author says, is a worse punishment, than all the Magistrate can inflict "upon the body, [as giving men over to the World, and "to Satan.] Now look back a little, and sum up all: "It is a general rule, laid down by all sides, [Conscience "may not, must not be forced in matters of Religion, by "any Coercive power.] Then, neither by the Church, and Magistrate, neither spiritually nor corporally? The Church may no more force conscience, then the Magistrate; yet the Church exercising and executing Examination upon an Heretick, or scandalous person, exercises a Coercive power, and (as they will say) over their consciences; for they verily believe themselves in the right Religion: Therefore, either the exercise of Coercive power by the Church, is also unlawful, and so he hath destroyed the power of the Church in matters of Religion, as well as of the Magistrate, or else, it is no force over mens consciences, but over the errors of their consciences. And lastly, If it be lawful for the Church to restrain and chastise an Heretick by her spiritual censures, without any force to her conscience: Why may it not be lawful for the Magistrate to restrain such a soul-destroying Heretick, by bodily punishments, and yet without force upon his conscience? Why may not the Magistrate deliver such a man to the Jaylor, as the Church delivers him to the Devil? Especially, the end of both being, (as much as in them lies) to save his soul: Whence I conclude against him; this Power of the Magistrate, is no *Usurpation* of the Dominion of Christ, or the Power of the Church; much less, *Treason* against Christ. Thus weakly hath M. *Collier* argued hitherto; we shall hear of him again ere long.

3. His third Reason is borrowed from a wise Author, ["The Vindicators of Sir *Henry Vane*. Nothing can be "more against the spiritual good of People, than to make "them hypocrites in Religion, professing to believe what "they do not] Learned Sout! Hath not the State and Church of *England* commanded all their People to frequent our Congregations, under a penalty, every Lords Day? Hath not this man accordingly frequented them? And hath he been all this while an hypocrite, professing to believe, what he doth not? But if force in Religion make men hypocrites, why did God command *Abraham* to circumcise all the males of his family? Why did the Godly Magistrates command all their Subjects, under the Old Testament, to serve the Lord, according to the worship prescribed? Did God or men intend to make them hypocrites? Which they must have done, if Coercive power did make them so: Alas, most men are hypocrites already, though they be not forced to worship God; therefore Coercive power does not make, but find and discovers hypocrites. Must not God be obeyed, though men be hypocrites? But real Christians, (who only can truly be forced against conscience) do not turn hypocrites, but refuse obedience, and chuse to suffer, which discovers their faith and patience, and brings much glory to God. There must be persecution (as well as Heresies) that they which are approved may be known. It is therefore by accident, that such force makes men appear hypocrites, by commanding them to obey the Laws of God; the Law of God irritates corruption, but causes it not *Rom.* 7. 13, 23. If then God, or men from God, command men to worship God, according to his will, they find many hypocrites, but do not make them such: They sin if they serve him not, and if hypocritically, they sin also, and its hard to say, which is worst: But this is some of the new light of this age, that Children must not be taught their Commandments, Creed, or Lords Prayer, or read the Scriptures, because they are yet hypocrites, & none must receive the Lords Supper, that knows not himself regenerate, lest it make him an hypocrite. Enough of this.

4. His

4. His fourth Reaſon is taken out of the Levellers Catechiſm. A Levelling Principle indeed, to deny the Magiſtrates power in matters of Religion firſt, and then in civil affairs: If all were levelled, and but content to be ſo, what need, what uſe of a Magiſtrate? But hear their worthy Reaſon: "[It's againſt the nature of faith and worſhip to be forced: Chriſt hath ordained the preaching of the Goſpel, "to be the outward means of converting ſouls, and ſpiri-"tual Ordinances for puniſhment of erroneous and hereti-"cal perſons, &c.] This hath been ſpoken to in anſwering Mr. *Colliers* firſt and ſecond reaſons, and in the laſt before: But I add further, it contradicts it ſelf twice: 1. In ſaying, that the preaching of the word is the outward means of Converſion; and yet denies any force to bring profeſſed Chriſtians to the attending on that means. 2. That they allow ſpiritual puniſhment, which is a greater force, for reducing erroneous and heretical perſons; and yet denies not only the Magiſtrate, to uſe any the leaſt force to the bodies or eſtates of men, but any force at all over mens conſciences: If no force may be uſed, then not the ſpiritual, as was ſaid afore. Laſtly, he takes for granted (what we utterly deny) that we allow the Church a power, to puniſh miſ-believers (or miſ-livers) in bodies or purſes. Some have done ſo, but I hope they have had time to repent it, for ſo diſhonouring the Church.

5. The next is from a better Author, but to as little "purpoſe [From the parable of the Tares among the "Wheat, both muſt be let alone till the Harveſt; the "Wheat are the elect, the Tares are Hereticks, &c.] It might be enough to anſwer this, that it is a parable, which is a ſimilitude, and muſt not be ſtrained beyond its ſcope, which is, to let us know, that good and bad, upright and hypocrites muſt be in the Church, till the end of the World: And yet ſome are about to make a Church of all Saints, and to pluck up the Wheat, in pretence of pulling up the Tares: But 2. By Tares, cannot well be meant heretical perſons (not in *Auſtin's* judgment) for he and other Doctors, with the Scripture, allow Excommunication of Hereticks

reticks and ſcandalous perſons, which is not only a plucking up of the Tares, but a caſting them out of the Church, into Hell, without repentance. 3. Our Saviour himſelf tells us, who are the tares, the children of the wicked one, and ſuch as do iniquity. *Mat.* 13. 38. 41. Now hence it would follow, that neither Church, nor Magiſtrate muſt puniſh ſuch, but let them alone to the end of the World; a pleaſing Doctrine to thieves, and all wicked perſons. But if, notwithſtanding this parable, it be lawful for the Church, to puniſh Hereticks ſpiritually, and for the Magiſtrate to puniſh them corporally; he hath miſtaken the parable: And if the Magiſtrate may puniſh a murdrour bodily, for killing the bodies of men; why ſhould it be unlawful for him to puniſh an heretical ſeducer, that deſtroyes mens ſouls, and that eternally? I leave him to conſider it.

"6. He fetches this next Reaſon from far [from the "judgment of the ancients, and practiſe of the primitive "Church; *Lactan. Tertull.* &c. who ſeem to deny all "force in Religion:] A little may ſerve for this. There is a difference, to be put between Heathens and Chriſtians, in matters of Religion: The Ancients ſpeak againſt forcing Heathens into Chriſtianity, till they firſt be informed, and convinced of the truth thereof, not of compelling profeſſed Chriſtians, to the outward Worſhip of God, as the King of *Judah* did. 2. The practiſe of Chriſtian Emperours, was accordingly, for the moſt part, with reſpect to Heathens. Yet ſome of them made Edicts, to command all their ſubject to be of the Chriſtian Religion: *Juſtinian*, and others, as were eaſie to inſtance. 3. In Preſsing this Argument too far, he forgot himſelf, that he makes his Pope, and popiſh Princes worſe then Turks, and Furies, in their perſecution of Proteſtants. And let them but give this liberty of conſcience to all their ſubjects, which he pleads for in *England*, and lay aſide their coercive power, and I believe Popery will have but a few clients; moſt of them would quickly forſake their Church and Religion, eſpecially, if they might have the truth freely taught by ſome Proteſtants. 7. But

7. But a reason fetcht from a principle of nature, and "natural light, will convince any reasonable man? [It's "against the golden rule of natural righteousness, do as "we would be done by; and do not to others, what we "would not have done to our selves; but who would be "content to be persecuted by others for his Religion? &c.] Truly, no man would, or at least should be persecuted for his true Religion; but he that would not be prosecuted for a false Religion, argues himself to be unrighteous, and to violate that principle of nature; and another like it, *Æquo animo panam, qui meruere luant.* Let him make this rule universal, and thieves, and malefactors will give him many thanks: What Thieves would be contents to be hang'd by a Magistrate? *Ergo*, If he get to be a Magistrate, he must not hang a Thief, *&c.* Bring it neerer to himself; what Jesuite would be content to be executed, for sedition, and seducement of Protestants, from their Religion, and Loyalty, *Ergo.* nor should they persecute Protestants in their Dominions: How likes he this? The Golden Rule, is made for true rectifyed consciences, not for every one that pretends it: What in true reason, I would have another do, or not do, to me; that I should be content to do, or not do to another: If a man should argue thus; I would not be content to be persecuted for the true Religion, *Ergo*, I must not prosecute one that is in the false: Or thus, If I am an Heretick, perverting Souls, and would not be restrained or punished for so doing; *Ergo*, I must let others alone, and not punish them for the same; both these consequences are false and unreasonable, and meer pervertings and crookings of that Golden Rule: This is a Jesuitical consequence; I would not be punished for my seducement in *England*; *Ergo*, I may plead for Toleration of Popery, and all Religions: This consequence, I say, is good now in *England*, to cheat simple souls; but would be denyed with an Inquisition at *Rome* or in *Spain*. Such another fallacy is that; which followes, a Christian must pray for his Enemies; *Ergo*, he must not persecute his brother, be he never so wicked. (*q. d.*) I must pray for a Thief or Murderer,

Heretick;

Heretick; *Ergo*, I may not profecute them to juſt punifh-ment, corporally the one, ſpiritually the other.

8. The next reaſon comes yet neerer home; *ad hominem*, as we ſay; and that is thus. [It is againſt our own prin-ciples] and the teſtimony of an Adverſary is moſt ſtrong againſt himſelf: Wherein? In three things.

" 1. [We profeſs our ſelves to be fallible, in judging " univerſally in matters of Religion, and object it to the " Papiſts, pretending infallibility; but by perſecuting others " for conſcience, we make our ſelves infallible, as Mr. *Collier* " wiſely obſerves.] For this, he hath been told; we per-ſecute no man for his conſcience, but may proſecute a man for an erring conſcience; which he ſtill concludes, a juſt proſecution, with an unjuſt perſecution. 2. We profeſs our ſelves to be fallible, or not infallible, *in* the Popiſh ſenſe: He deludes us, with the equivocation of the words. If he mean that we hold our ſelves fallible, *univerſally* in all matters of Religion, that we are uncertain of all points of Religion, and certain of nothing, that were to make us meer *Scepticks* in our Religion, and we own not ſuch a fallibility: On the other ſide, we do not think our ſelves infallible uni-verſally in matters of Religion, as the *Pope does*; but that in ſome fundamental truths, we are infallible, that is, moſt certain of the truths of our Religion, clearly revealed in Scripture, which is an infallible rule; though we are not alwayes able to apply it. But the *Pope* as he makes him-ſelf infallible in all points of Religion, which he determines out of the *Pontifical Chair*; ſo he does it in things beſides, and againſt the Scripture; and this we object to him, as an hainous *crime*, and high *uſurpation* of the prerogative of Jeſus Chriſt, ſpeaking in the Scripture. 3. What need is there that we muſt be infallible, to judg and puniſh an He-" retick? why this [We cannot rationally perſecute any " man for his conſcience, unleſs we do not only know that he " is in an error, but alſo be infallibly ſure, that we are bring-" ing him to an undoubted truth:] Be it ſo, then we aſ-ſume; we may know that the man is in an errour, (if we may know the truth) and be infallibly ſure, we are bring-ing him to an undoubted truth; *Ergo*, we may perſecute

(we say, prosecute) him for his erring conscience: *e. g.* We know certainly, that he that denies a God, or Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, and Saviour of the World, is in an error, and we are infallibly sure, we are bringing him to an undoubted truth, to profess a God, and Jesus Christ: and *Ergo*, we may, by his own *premises*, persecute, or rather prosecute him for his erring conscience. Whereupon the following assertion is most unchristian and "uncharitable: [It would be better for us, to let him "alone in his (known, damning) errors, than to force him "to ours, which we, (not falsly as he) truly esteem "truth.] [The very mercies of the wicked are cruel:] 4. These men seem to be *Scepticks* in their Religion; for if there be any Religion, or rules of faith and worship delivered in Scripture, we may come to be infallibly sure, that this is the Truth of God, and thereby discover errors, and consequently may prosecute them, though we be not universally infallible. The Magistrates of the Old Testament might not force any mans conscience, more than now; nor were more infallible, than ours are now; yet having a cleer rule of Religion, and worship given them; they compelled their subjects to observe it; why may not ours do so now, having a cleer light, and greater illumination? Is it not a certain and infallible truth, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and only Saviour of the World? If not, what an uncertain thing is Christianity, which depends upon that one principle? If it be, shall any man professing the Christian Religion, be suffered to deny that truth, and blaspheme that holy name with impurity, because the Magistrate, or Church, is not in all things infallible? Lastly, as to this first principle, *ex ungue leonem*; we may descry and discover (the Fox) the *Jesuite*, by his strong plea for Toleration to his *Recusants*, or Papists. Though he speak in the person of Protestants, as if one of them; yet his secret, or open girding at the State, shews what he is; "[Who having laid aside the King, by whom, and for "whom, those laws (of restraint) were made, which is "indeed the abolishing of those Laws; yet we keep up the "penalties of those Laws, in vigour against Recusants,

"which

'which ſeems to be a very irrational Act:] And puts this Jeer upon the preſent powers, (by way of thanks or 'ſcorne) for their granted Toleration, [That as we have "not one particular poſitive *Religion* ſetled, for undoubted "truth amongſt us: So we purpoſe not any one *Religion* to "the Recuſants, to be followed by them, but at moſt hold 'them out a medly of all Sects profeſt in the Nation, &c.] *Quis tulerit Gracchos, de Seditione querentes?* The Subtle curſed Jeſuites, ſelf condemned men, have broken our *Religion* into ſo many Sects and Fractions, to keep us from Setling the true *Religion*, and then make themſelves merry with our diviſions. The Lord rebuke them. This to our firſt principle.

2. 'The next is: [We have always pretended a general "Toleration for all tender conſciences, of which kind, there "are ſome amongſt the Prelatical and Popiſh party:] And yet they only are excepted from Toleration by the Parlia-'ment: for ſo he means it. But he goes on ſtill, [Grant "it to a poor ſneaking fooliſh fellow, that can ſcarce ſpeak "ſenſe, and hath hardly a groat in his purſe, to loſe for his "conſcience, and deny it to men of Honour, Prudence and "Eſtates, ſuffering meerly for their conſcience, as having 'no tender conſciences.] 1. Me thinks I hear the proud 'Phariſees ſpeak, in this Jeſuite, [This people that knoweth "not the Law is curſed; and Lord I thank thee, I am not as other men:] He cals mean ſimple Chriſtians, *Sneaking Fellows*, as if they had no conſcience, becauſe they have no 'Eſtates; He may remember, [Not many Wiſe, not many 'Noble or Mighty.] were called, or honoured to be *primitive Martyrs*; to ſuffer meerly for conſcience: They had too much to loſe, to dare to profeſs Chriſtianity; [But God hath choſen the fooliſh things of the world to confound the wiſe, &c.] He may read the reſt, 1 Cor. 1. 26 &c. And he makes men of *Honour*, *Prudence* and *Eſtates*, to have tender conſciences, meerly for ſuffering in their Eſtates: whereas he knows many ſuch may and do ſuffer only, for the *Religion* delivered them by Tradition from their Fathers, or out of ſome carnal reſpects: If a man deſired to be looſe and profane, he need not chuſe an eaſier *Reli-*

gion than Popery: And the Divel hath had his *Martyrs* and *Confessors*, as well as Christ: *Martyres Satanicæ virtutis*, as *Cyprian*: &c 2. But I have, I confess, often wondered, that those in power, who pretend so much favour to all tender consciences, should so often, by name, except the Prelatical and Popish party; when as, there may be as tender consciences in some of them, as in some, whom they tolerate; and also, their laxe and loose principles, and these reasons carry toleration for all, or none.

Some Satisfaction I received from one, that also pleads for Toleration, (as I thought) for all *Religions*, (for his Arguments are as strong for all, as for any) why the Popish party should not have any Toleration granted them, above all the rest. Let him be heard speak in his own words. ["As for Popery and Idolatry, why they also may not "plead to be tolerated, I have much less to say: Their *Re-* "*ligion*, the more considered, the less can it be acknow- "ledged a *Religion*; but a *Roman* principallity, rather en- "devouring to keep up her old universal Dominion, under "a new name and meer shadow of a Catholick *Religion*; "being indeed more rightly named, a Catholick heresie a- "gainst the Scripture, and except in *Rome*, supported "mainly by a civil and forrain power; justly therefore to "be suspected, not tolerated by the Magistrate of another "Country. Besides, of an Implicite Faith, which they "profess, the conscience also becomes implicit, and so by "voluntary servitude to mans law, forfeits her Christian "Liberty. Who then can plead for such a conscience, as be- "ing inthrall'd implicitly to man, instead of God, almost "becomes no conscience, as the will, not free, becomes no "will. Lastly, for Idolatry, (whereof the *Romish* Church, "is justly charged, to be deeply guilty) who knows it not "to be evidently against all Scripture, both of the Old and "New Testament. And therefore a true Heresie, or rather "Impiety; wherein a right conscience can have nought to "do, and the works thereof so manifest, that a Magistrate "can hardly err, in prohibiting, and quite removing at "least the publick and scandalous use thereof.] How this will please Jesuits, or how they will answer it, I neither know,

J. Milton. tract. of civil power, in Ecclesiasti- cal causes. *p* 35.

know, nor care: But I ſatisfied my ſelf, with one or both of theſe conſiderations. 1. That they might except them, not out of conſcience, but out of ſtate pollicy; becauſe, on the one ſide; if the prelatical party ſhould have a Toleration, they might in time return to challenge and take from them, thoſe fat and ſweet morſels of the Biſhops Revenues, which ſome of them have ſwallowed down, and would be loath to vomit up again. On the other ſide, if the Popiſh party ſhould be tolerated (I will not ſay, they ſhould loſe a good Revenue from Sequeſtration of two parts of their Eſtates, though ſome give this for a reaſon) their Principles are deſtructive to Heretical Magiſtrates, as the Pope can eaſily make them, and ſo ſubverſive of their New Common-wealth: Thats one. 2. The other conſideration to ſtay my wonder, was, That, that exception was ſo often inſerted, by ſome Jeſuitical finger, that if ever that party got power into their hands, they might the more colourable deny Toleration to thoſe, who being in place, did firſt deny it to them: for this is a maxime amongſt the 'Sectaries [They that deny toleration to others tender 'conſciences, deſerve not to have it for themſelves] And then they that now plead for Toleration of the worſt ſort of tender conſciences, will at laſt, grant more to thoſe, whoſe conſciences are truly tender, and moſt rightly principled: I wiſh I may be a falſe prophet, in this conſideration. But hear the next.

I Milt. ubi ſuprà. p. 36.

3. '[It is againſt another Principle of ours; we allow "people the Bible in the vulgar language, and preſs them to "ſearch the Scripture, to find out the mind of God, and at "laſt by our coerſive power, will have them believe, as the "the Church believes; we bid men (as wiſely Mr *Collier* "ſpeaks) ſee with their own eyes, and yet put them to ſee 'with others eyes.] We bid men (with our Saviour) to ſearch the Scriptures, and with the *Bereans*, not content themſelves, to believe as the Church believes, (that was the Colliers, and the Papiſts beliefe) but to try the truths held out by Church or Magiſtrate; which if they do faithfully and ſincerely, they will ſee the truths with their own "eyes: [If any man, will do his will, he ſhall know of the

doctrine

" Doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I ſpeak of my ſelf, Jo 7.17.] And we ſuppoſe and take for granted, (which this man makes doubtful) that there is a pattern of ſound words, the true faith and worſhip of God, held forth firſt in the Scriptures, and then by the Church or Magiſtrate; and ſhe upon exhort men, not to take any thing upon truſt of men, which is not faith, but ignorance, or Popiſh credulity; but in matters of Salvation, to ſearch and ſee by their own eyes. And if it happen that private perſons miſtake error for truth, they muſt either be meekly willing to hearken to inſtruction, (which is a ſign of a good conſcience) or reſolve rather to ſuffer for their judgment, than to diſturb the peace of the Church or State: For while they keep it to themſelves, none can take notice of it, or judg them for it. But this diſpute allowes them, either to reſiſt the coercive power, and labour their ſubverſion (as in his firſt Argument) or elſe to be tolerated, though never ſo damnably heretical, and practically deſtructive to themſelves or others. True charity of Proteſtants, bids thoſe that have the charge of their ſouls (which both Miniſters and Magiſtrates have, in their own way.) Firſt, with meekneſs, and much patience to inſtruct them, and if they ſtill continue obſtinate, like mad men to miſchief themſelves and others, to lay fetters of reſtraint upon them, either ſpiritual or corporal, that they may do no further hurt.

" 9. The next Reaſon is this: [It was againſt the judgment of " King *James*, and other Kings, and againſt the peoples frequent peti- " tions, for toleration, *&c.*] Firſt, for King *James*, two of his ſayings " are produced; [That God never plants a Church, by violence and " bloodſhed.] True, for he left that for the Jeſuites amongſt the poor Indians: *So* ſpake *Tertullian* and *Lactanc.* above; Religion is not to be forced upon Heathens; God does not firſt plant a Church by violence, much leſs by bloodſhed; but when a Church is planted (as a Vine) he allows pruning and purging of it, by ſpiritual cenſures; which (in this mans ſenſe) is a kind of force upon conſcience: And the Magiſtrate being a guardian, or nurſe-keeper of the Church, as Gods vicegerent, is to publiſh and maintain Religion, in the purity of it, which cannot be done without coercive power, not upon mens conſciences, but " upon their bodies or eſtates. His other ſpeech, [That he never in- " tended any perſecution any againſt the Papiſts, for conſcience ſake, " but deſired to be ſecured for civil obedience, which they cannot deny.] Not to tell him that King *James* did not own, but oppoſe their Religion " as falſe, [whoſe Faith is Faction, whoſe Religion is Rebellion:] he knows who ſaid it: If he did reſtrain them from practiſing it publickly, it was not perſecution of them for conſcience ſake, but proſecution of an erring conſcience: But I ſay, when they were reſtrained from exerciſe of their Religion, it was with reſpect to a principle of their Religion, denying to give him ſecurity in civil obedience; from " a ſtated-deſtroying opinion and practiſe of theirs, [That it is law- " ful, yea, neceſſary, if the *Pope* command it, to murder and kill here- " tical Kings;] Whereof his predeceſſors and himſelf, had frequent experience, in ſuch like attempts; the examples of other Kings in tolerating other Religions, I fear, is rather out of political Intereſt, than " real piety: As for that ſcandal upon the powers, [That the State in

"perſecuting them now, will be greater perſecutors then the old Magiſtrates "and Biſhops were, yea, than the Spaniſh Inquiſition it ſelf:] I leave to them to anſwer, or chaſtiſe ſuch Jeſuitical inſolence. One thing aſperſive upon the Biſhops and others, is fouly, and fooliſhly aſſerted, "and eaſily wiped away. [They to prove the lawfulneſs of their vo- "cation, againſt the *Puritans*, derived their orders from *Rome*; yet con- "curred with the State to make the Laws, that any that received orders "from *Rome*, were Traitors, which was moſt ridiculous.] But 1. The *Puritans* did not brand their vocation from *Rome*; in the firſt Proteſtant Biſhops in *England*; ſome of them were ordained Presbyters by ſuch; the Browniſts and Anabaptiſts did that. 2. The Biſhops with the State, made a Law, that none of their Miniſters ſhould take orders from *Rome*, In a State way; firſt, becauſe that was a denial of our miniſtry to be good at home. Secondly, It was an owning of the Popes ſupremacy ſpiritual, in *England*; which appears by this, that they ſo far allowed ordination by a Romiſh Biſhop, that they did not re-ordain thoſe Prieſts, which were converted unto the Proteſtant Religion. But if Papiſts and Jeſuites be of the ſame opinions as afore: That heretical Magiſtrates may be murdered, and maintain revelations, and impulſies of ſpirit, to kill any, whom their ſpirit bids them kill, (which our young Quakers have learnt of them) as the State or Government, what ever it be, (though Kings be gone) have no reaſon in policy to tolerate ſuch; ſo it will be no perſecution of them for conſcience ſake, but a wiſe and juſt proſecution of them, for ſuch deſtructive principles, as make the owners of them unfit to live amongſt men, in any civil ſociety. And as for the petitions of the people, for liberty of conſcience; as they were made tendered by ſome few Sectaries, whoſe looſe opinions and practiſes will abide no government, not by the generality of the moſt and beſt people of the Land; ſo in a right- "ſenſe, it is grated by theſe, [That a care be had of truly tender conſcien- "ces, *viz.* [Who profeſs faith in Chriſt, and live peaceably, in godlineſs "and honeſty;] But they only deſire ſome diſcipline may be exerciſed upon ſuch, his either deny Jeſus Chriſt, directly, or by neceſſary conſequence, or live not peaceably, but by earneſt propagation of their errors and hereſies, deſtroy both their own and others ſouls, and diſturb the peace of Church and State; or have neither godlineſs nor honeſty in their lives. Yet theſe that plead for ſuch a Government, are the men againſt whom he "cunningly inveighs p. 25. [As dangerous perſons, that deſire to domi- "neer and tyrannize over other mens conſciences; and as their judgments "are not greatly to be heeded, ſo themſelves are rather cleſly to be looked "too, leſt they ſet all on fire again], as the Jeſuites have lately done, as the "incendiaries of all States, when ever they come: And again, he ſtirs up the Nation againſt them p. 30. [It were juſt, that ſuch bouteſeues.]

"10. Laſtly, (ſayes he) [coercive power is againſt our own Intereſt "at home, and the Proteſtant Intereſt abroad; at home, becauſe by fit, "we ſay a foundation of perſecution to our ſelves and poſterity. If it "be lawful for us to perſecute others; ſo it will be for them, towards "us if they get power: So Mr. *Collier*] According to the proverb, like to like, quoth the Divel to the Collier; for what a fine new way have theſe men found, to fruſtrate the predictions of Chriſt, and his

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

"shall have tribulation, *Job.* 16. last. All that will live Godly, shall "suffer persecution, *&c.*] Their best Interest were to sit still, and meddle with no bodies sins or errors: How foolish was *Paul* to excommunicate those Hereticks, that is, in this new canting Language, to persecute them; if it was lawful for *Paul* to persecute and molest them for their faith and conscience, it was lawful for them to persecute and excommunicate him; and what a disturbance might this cause in the Church? Foolish Politicians; the profession of the Gospel in truth and sincerity, looks not at our own Interest in the World, but expects persecution; teaching men to deny themselves, to forsake all, their goods, their peace, their lives, were not this as politick an Argument in a Corporation, "where Officers are Annual: [Be favourable to drunkards and profane persons in this your year, lest one of them get into place next "year, and persecute you: It is for your Interest, lest you lay a foundation of persecution, to your selves, or your posterity; for if it be "lawful for you to exercise coercive power over others, by the same rule "of reason, it will be lawful for others to persecute you.] 2. Say the "same for the Protestant Interest abroad; [If we persecute men of "their Religion here, they will persecute ours there, *&c.*] If he shall say, there is not the same reason in matters civil, as in Religion; I shall choak him first by a Scripture Instance; *Nehemiah* was a prudent man, but he had not learned the Jesuites politicks: He used coercive power towards the Heathen Merchants (as well as his own Nations) in a matter of Religion, the *profanation of the Sabbath*; threatning to lay them by the heels, if they brought any more *Wares* to sell, on that day; How imprudently with respect to the Jewish Interest abroad! Did he not lay a foundation of persecution of his Country-men, in their dominions, in that, or some other point of their Religion? Secondly, I confute his policy, by Scripture reason; The Magistrate is the Minister of "God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil. *Rom.* 13. 4.] Therefore, he must either say, that it is not evil, for an heretical seducer to destroy the subjects souls, or else the Magistrate must use coercive power to restrain and punish such; let his Interest be what it will, at home or abroad. In a word, there is as great a distance between persecution, and prosecution, as between innocency, and wickedness, truth and error; and surely both ought not to enjoy the same priviledges, shall truth have but a Toleration, as well as error? He must therefore make this "consequence (the foundation of his error) good; [It is lawful for "truth and innocency, to prosecute error and wickedness. *Ergo*, It is "lawful, by the same reason, for error and wickedness, to persecute truth "and innocency] or he shews himself a very Sophister, Cheater, [illegible] Seducer, and that he hath done sufficiently, in all his reasons.

A POSTSCRIPT.

Reader,

IF this little discourse, for removing the false foundations of England's Settlement, find favour and acceptance with thee; expect shortly (if God permit) another like it, laying down, and fixing the true and solid Foundations of its Settlement, Righteousness, *and* Religion; *together with the true and many causes of our so long unsettlement*: Fare well.